

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,169	01/22/2001	Mehmed K. Younouzov	2765	2576
23618	10/10/2003		EXAM	INER
CHASE & YAKIMO, L.C.			HEWITT II, CALVIN L	
4400 COLLEGE BOULEVARD, SUITE 130 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66211		E 130	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
0 . 221.0			3621	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	_					
	Office Action Summary	09/767,169	YOUNOUZOV, MEHMED K.			
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Examiner	Art Unit			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Calvin L Hewitt II	3621			
Perio	d for Reply					
TH - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL IE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl f NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period is allure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute favor the provided by the Office later than three months after the mailing tearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I36(a). In no event, however, may a ly within the statutory minimum of thi will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO e, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22.	January 2001 .				
2a)[☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	nis action is non-final.				
3)[closed in accordance with the practice under					
٠.	sition of Claims	_				
4)(Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress.					
5)[4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
6)[· · ·					
7)[Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
,-	☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement				
	cation Papers	r cicolori requirement.				
9)[\square The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)[☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	pted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abey	/ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)[The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)□ approved b)□ ∈	disapproved by the Examiner.			
_	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re	, •				
12)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer.				
Priorit	y under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
14)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti					
_	a) The translation of the foreign language pro Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest	ovisional application has b	peen received.			
Attachn		, , ,				
2) 🔲 N	otice of References Cited (PTO-892) otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _	5) Notice of	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 3621

Status of Claims

1. Claims 1-17 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 1-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. Claim 1 recites the limitation "accessing a second website of said online provider" in lines 15-16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Specifically, the claim does not recite a first website of said online service provider.
 - Claims 2-11 are also rejected as they depend from claim 1.
- 5. Claim 13 recites the limitation "scanning said barcode" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 3621

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1-3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boies et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,006,200 in view of

As per claims 1-3 and 12, Boies et al. teach a system for distributing goods from a website comprising: connecting a computer to an ISP, running a browser on said computer, storing a user's real name and address on a remote computer, storing a virtual name and address at said remote computer linked to the real name and address, accessing a second website, presenting an item by and selecting an item for purchase from an online service provider and utilizing said virtual name and address for shipping information (abstract; figures 1 and 2A; column 2, lines 1-10). Boies et al. teach online transactions (abstract) and a user ordering goods online (figure 2A). Hence, it is at least obvious that he contacting of the Registry is also done online (Figure 2A, items 203 and 204; column 2, lines 1-10). Boies et al. also teach sending the item to said virtual address, receiving said item at a location corresponding to said virtual address.

Art Unit: 3621

Regarding "re-labeling" it is at least obvious that this occurs in order to conform with USPS mailing rules and regulations. Boies et al. also teach a shipper having access to a third website, connecting to said third website and shipping labels (figure 2C; column 1, lines 23-35; column 2, lines 1-46). What is printed on the label is non-functional descriptive material.

8. Claims 4-7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boies et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,006,200 as applied to claims 1-3 and in further view of Bezos, U.S. Patent No. 5,727,163.

As per claims 4-7 and 13, Boies et al. teach a method and system for providing a virtual name and address to a user for use in making purchases over the internet (abstract). Boies et al. teach shipping labels (figure 2C). Regarding barcodes, the use and function of Postal barcodes, such as POSTNET are old and well known. However, Boies et al. do not specifically recite an optional payment method associated with said service. Bezos et al. teach a method for charging a user for providing goods and services wherein the charging comprises an optional payment method (figure 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Boies et al. and Bezos et al. in order to receive compensation for providing users anonymous shipping services.

Art Unit: 3621

9. Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boies et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,006,200 as applied to claims 1-3 above and in further view of Walker et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,163,771.

As per claims 8-11, Boies et al. teach a method and system for providing a virtual name and address to a user for use in making purchases over the internet (abstract). However, Boies et al. do not explicitly recite virtual credit card numbers. Walker et al. teach a method and system for protecting user credit card information by generating virtual credit card numbers (abstract) where the virtual card numbers are associated with a user's real card numbers (figure 13; column/line 11/62-12/18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Boies et al. and Walker et al. in order to protect user financial data, such as credit card data ('771, column/line 2/7-3/5).

10. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boies et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,006,200 as applied to claims 1-3 and in further view of Rhoads, U.S. Patent No. 6,311,214.

As per claims 14-17, Boies et al. teach a method and system for providing a virtual name and address to a user for use in making purchases over the internet (abstract; figure 2A; column 2, lines 1-10). Specifically, Boies et al. teach a third party shipper that associates a real name and address with a received virtual name and address in order to deliver a package (column 2, lines 55-64).

Boies et al. also teach shipping labels (figure 2C). Regarding barcodes, the use and function of Postal barcodes, such as POSTNET are old and well known. However, Boies et al. do not specifically recite using websites to associate a real name and address with a virtual name and address. Rhoads teaches a product ordering system that uses scannable codes embedded with website data to obtain more information about a product or service and to relay customer payment information to said website (column 1, lines 40-58; column/line 23/60-24/23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to implement the system of Boies et al. using the scannable codes of Rhoads in order to more efficiently process user orders by reducing the amount of time it takes to obtain shipping or postal data.

Conclusion

- 11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:
 - Gabber et al. teach a system for anonymous browsing
 - Ikeda teaches a method and system for accessing a website via a barcode

Art Unit: 3621

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Calvin Loyd Hewitt II whose telephone number is (703) 308-8057. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell, can be reached at (703) 305-9768.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

c/o Technology Center 2100

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687 (for formal communications intended for entry and after-final communications),

or:

(703) 746-5532 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, 7th Floor Receptionist.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)

Art Unit: 3621

308-1113.

Calvin Loyd Hewitt II

October 2, 2003

/ JOHN W. HAYES PRIMARY EXAMINE